

In the Drawings:

In Figure 2 the reference numeral 80 to the heating coil has now been added and the array of holes 102 have been shown more clearly. An amended replacement sheet of Figure 2 is enclosed together with copies of the drawings (11 sheets) as originally filed.

REMARKS:

The claims and the dependencies have been renumbered as requested by the Examiner.

Minor additional changes in dependency have also been made.

Claims 2, 18 and 19 have been cancelled and a new Claim 46 has been added so that the total number of claims has been reduced. Claim 2 has been incorporated into Claim 1 and Claims 18 and 19 are duplicates of other claims and thus are redundant.

The minor corrections requested in the drawing of Figure 2 have been made and a replacement sheet of Figure 2 is enclosed.

The minor correction in the specification has been made as requested by the Examiner.

A Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the objection of double patenting is filed herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the requisite fee of \$65 to our Deposit Account No: 01-0310. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Minor corrections have been made in the claims concerning the terms "duct" and "two inlets" to ensure consistency. Additional corrections of a similar nature have also been made as will be noted by the Examiner.

Independent Clams 1, 20 and 37 remain in the application and no additional independent claims have been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of Claim 2. Claim 2 was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable and hence it is submitted that the amended Claim 1 is now in good order for allowance without further comment.

Allowed Claim 20 remains in the application and has only been mended for consistency of language as requested by the Examiner. It is submitted therefore that Claim 20 is in good order for allowance without further comment.

In regard to Claim 37, this claim has been amended to more clearly point out that the air intake to the plenum is below the bench and the air outlet from the duct is above the bench and the fan is arranged to direct the air from the inlet to the outlet.

The Examiner has rejected original Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C.102 in view of Takano. However it is fully clear from the Abstract in English of this reference that the outside air is drawn by the fan 6 through the outside inlet 12 or the inside inlet 11 into the duct 7. From that duct the air is expelled through the "air supplying branch ducts" 8 which are located underneath the bench. Thus the direction of flow is clearly opposite to that set forth in the Claim 37. Thus Takano does not show the features of the claim as now made more clear.

The Examiner has not suggested that any other prior art document shows this direction of flow. Clearly Sonoda shows the same flow direction as Takano as indicated by the arrows in Figure 2. The Examiner has this not even suggested a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 let alone established a *prima facie* case as required in MPEP.

It is submitted therefore that all of the claims are in good order for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

DAVID BRAULT ET AL

PER:

Adrian D. Battison
Registration No: 31,726

ADB/II
May 11, 2005

Enc.(16)

Adrian D. Battison Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
Telephone (204) 944-0032 - FAX (204) 942-5723

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306, on May 11, 2005

LYNN LEATHERDALE

Lynn Leatherdale